



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/976,538	10/12/2001	Michael P. McLeod	7504-80241	1515
24628	7590	12/07/2005	EXAMINER	
WELSH & KATZ, LTD 120 S RIVERSIDE PLAZA 22ND FLOOR CHICAGO, IL 60606			OROPEZA, FRANCES P	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3766	

DATE MAILED: 12/07/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Tmtu

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/976,538

Applicant(s)

MCLEOD ET AL.

Examiner

Frances P. Oropeza

Art Unit

3766

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 9/22/05 (Amendment).
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s) No

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Amendment

1. The Applicant amended independent claim 1 in the reply filed 9/22/05, hence the rejection of record is withdrawn and a new rejection established in the subsequent paragraphs.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. Claims 1, 2 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Platt (US 6730025) in view of Albrecht et al. (US 6603995).

Platt discloses a physiological signal acquisition device comprising a hand-held portable processing element (2), and an acquisition unit (1) with sensors (6) (figure 1; col. 1 @ 4-8; col. 4 @ 13-34). The concept of disposing the acquisition unit on the chest amounts to an intended use limitation of which Platt performs or is inherently capable of performing. The processing element (2) is controlled by a CPU / a microprocessor which executes the software stored in the cartridge (col. 3 @ 4-9; col. 5 @ 65-67). The acquisition unit (1) comprises a digital signal processor (col. 4 @ 45-50) adapted to filter the electrocardiogram signal. The filtering occurs in the amplifier (10), the amplifier comprising a high pass filter and a low pass anti-aliasing filter (col. 5 @ 37-40). The digital signal process, including the analogue to digital converter controlled by signals (-CS and CLK), is controlled by processing element control system, the CPU / microprocessor (col. 4 @ 30-34; col. 4 @ 30-34 and 50-55; col. 5 @ 65-67).

Platt discloses the claimed invention except for the generation of a twelve lead electrocardiograph.

Albrecht et al. teach cardiac monitoring using circuitry and hardware to generate a twelve lead electrocardiograph signal for the purpose of providing comprehensive cardiac monitoring. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide circuitry and hardware to perform a twelve lead ECG in the Platt system in order to optimize the quality of the monitoring and the versatility of the system so cardiac conditions such as ischemia and myocardial infarction could be identified (abstract; col. 1 @ 24-45; col. 3 @ 42-50; col. 5 @ 6-27; col. 9 @ 58-67).

The Applicant's arguments filed 9/22/05 have been fully considered, but they are not convincing. In response to applicant's arguments that the references fail to show certain features of the Applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which the Applicant relies (i.e., the acquisition unit being "small, a relatively light weight structure", and "reduced electromagnetic interference and noise reduction" (the noise produced via feedback from the DSP 74 and instrumentation amplifier 84)) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

3. Claims 3 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Platt (US 6730025) in view of Albrecht et al. (US 6603995) and further in view of Rohde (US 5876351). As discussed in paragraph 2 of this action, modified Platt discloses the claimed invention except for the display being an LCD with sufficient resolution to display waveforms.

Rohde teaches data display on a GAMEBOY™ system using an LCD (20) with sufficient resolution to display waveforms for the purpose monitoring the ECG of the patient. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have used an LCD with sufficient resolution to display waveforms in the modified Platt system in order to provide a proven GAMEBOY™ communication means for signal display (col. 5 @ 18-21).

4. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Platt (US 6730025) in view of Albrecht et al. (US 6603995) and further in view of Skelton et al. (US 6292692). As discussed in paragraph 2 of this action, modified Platt discloses the claimed invention except for the screen being a touch screen interface.

Skelton et al. teach communications interface using a touch screen for the purpose of making input selection known to a controller/ microprocessor. Absent any teachings of criticality of unexpected results, merely changing the input means from a joypad and control buttons to a touch screen interface would be an obvious design choice.

5. Claims 6-11 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Platt (US 6730025) in view of Albrecht et al. (US 6603995) and further in view of Rockwell et al. (US 6141584). As discussed in paragraph 2 of this action, modified Platt discloses the claimed invention except for: a read only memory card (claims 6 and 7), wireless communication using an infrared transceiver (claim 8) or a radio frequency transceiver (claim 9), an audio recording

Art Unit: 3766

unit (claim 10), signal conditioning circuits (claim 11) and signal analysis and interpretation (claim 14).

As to a memory card, Rockwell et al. teach data storage using a read only memory card for the purpose of recording the ECG and audio data in memory. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have used the read only memory card in the modified Platt system in order to provide a mechanism enabling the collected data to be reviewed and analyzed at a future time (col. 11 @ 3-16).

As to wireless communication, Rockwell et al. teach wireless communication using infrared and radio frequency communication signals for the purpose of conveying information to remote locations. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have used infrared and radio frequency signals in the modified Platt system in order to enable sharing of information and report generation to optimize the patient's treatment (col. 5 @ 2-17).

As to an audio unit, Rockwell et al. teach event recording using an audio unit for the purpose of documenting events associated with patient interaction and care. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have used an audio unit in the modified Platt system in order to provide a more comprehensive understanding of the patient's condition and the treatment afforded the patient so the events are accurately reconstructed (col. 10 @ 1-9).

As to signal analysis, Rockwell et al. teach cardiac signal evaluation using signal analysis for the purpose of detecting the cardiac rhythm of the heart. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have used signal analysis in the

Art Unit: 3766

modified Platt system in order to alert the user to cardiac condition, so conditions such as ventricular tachycardia requiring immediate medical attention can be identified and treated (col. 10 @ 49-51).

6. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Platt (US 6730025) in view of Albrecht et al. (US 6603995) and further in view of Mogi (US 5873838). As discussed in paragraph 2 of this action, modified Platt discloses the claimed invention except for a baseline sway filter.

Mogi teaches electrocardiogram signal processing using a notch filter for the purpose of removing the sway / fluctuation produced by noise from the electrocardiogram signal. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have a notch filter for removing sway from the baseline electrocardiogram signal in the modified Platt system in order to provide a mechanism to produce an accurate and appropriate electrocardiogram waves for the processing unit so optimal diagnosis and treatment can be provided (abstract; col. 6 @ 34-44).

7. Claims 1, 2 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Platt (US 6730025) in view of Flach et al. (US 6773396) and further in view of Albrecht et al. (US 5891045). Platt discloses a physiological signal acquisition device comprising a hand-held portable processing element (2), and an acquisition unit (1) with sensors (6) (figure 1; col. 1 @ 4-8; col. 4 @ 13-34). The concept of disposing the acquisition unit on the chest amounts to an intended use limitation of which Platt performs or is inherently capable of

Art Unit: 3766

performing. The processing element (2) is controlled by a CPU / a microprocessor which executes the software stored in the cartridge (col. 3 @ 4-9; col. 5 @ 65-67). The acquisition unit (1) comprises a digital signal processor (col. 4 @ 45-50) adapted to filter the electrocardiogram signal. The filtering occurs in the amplifier (10), the amplifier comprising a high pass filter and a low pass anti-aliasing filter (col. 5 @ 37-40). The digital signal process, including the analogue to digital converter controlled by signals (-CS and CLK), is controlled by processing element control system, the CPU / microprocessor (col. 4 @ 30-34; col. 4 @ 30-34 and 50-55; col. 5 @ 65-67).

Platt discloses a device that is capable of being disposed on the chest of the patient and Flach et al. support this teaching.

Flach et al. teach signal acquisition using a data collection unit (102A) disposed on the chest of the patient that is connected to relatively short lead wires for the purpose of monitoring the ECG of the patient (figure 2; col. 7 @ 21-24). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used the data collection / data acquisition unit disposed on the chest of the patient that is connected to relatively short leadwires in the Platt system in order to provide a proven convenient compact system that secures the monitor to the patient enabling continuous data collection for the ambulatory patient (col. 1 @ 44-51).

As discussed in the previous three paragraphs, modified Platt discloses the claimed invention except for the generation of a twelve lead electrocardiograph.

Albrecht et al. teach cardiac monitoring using circuitry and hardware to generate a twelve lead electrocardiograph signal for the purpose of providing comprehensive cardiac monitoring.

Art Unit: 3766

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide circuitry and hardware to perform a twelve lead ECG in the modified Platt system in order to optimize the quality of the monitoring and the versatility of the system so cardiac conditions such as ischemia and myocardial infarction could be identified (abstract; col. 1 @ 24-45; col. 3 @ 42-50; col. 5 @ 6-27; col. 9 @ 58-67).

The Applicant's arguments filed 9/22/05 have been fully considered, but they are not convincing. In response to applicant's arguments that the references fail to show certain features of the Applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which the Applicant relies (i.e., the acquisition unit being "small, a relatively light weight structure", and "reduced electromagnetic interference and noise reduction" (the noise produced via feedback from the DSP 74 and instrumentation amplifier 84)) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

8. Claims 3 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Platt (US 6730025) in view of Flach et al. (US 6773396) and Albrecht et al. (US 5891045) and further in view of Rohde (US 5876351). As discussed in paragraph 6 of this action, modified Platt discloses the claimed invention except for the display being an LCD with sufficient resolution to display waveforms.

Rohde teaches data display on a GAMEBOY™ system using an LCD (20) with sufficient resolution to display waveforms for the purpose monitoring the ECG of the patient. It

Art Unit: 3766

would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have used an LCD with sufficient resolution to display waveforms in the modified Platt system in order to provide a proven GAMEBOY™ communication means for signal display (col. 5 @ 18-21).

9. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Platt (US 6730025) in view of Flach et al. (US 6773396) and Albrecht et al. (US 5891045) and further in view of Skelton et al. (US 6292692). As discussed in paragraph 6 of this action, modified Platt discloses the claimed invention except for the screen being a touch screen interface.

Skelton et al. teach communications interface using a touch screen for the purpose of making input selection known to a controller/ microprocessor. Absent any teachings of criticality of unexpected results, merely changing the input means from a joypad and control buttons to a touch screen interface would be an obvious design choice.

10. Claims 6-11 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Platt (US 6730025) in view of Flach et al. (US 6773396) and Albrecht et al. (US 5891045) and further in view of Rockwell et al. (US 6141584). As discussed in paragraph 6 of this action, modified Platt discloses the claimed invention except for: a read only memory card (claims 6 and 7), wireless communication using an infrared transceiver (claim 8) or a radio frequency transceiver (claim 9), an audio recording unit (claim 10), signal conditioning circuits (claim 11) and signal analysis and interpretation (claim 14).

As to a memory card, Rockwell et al. teach data storage using a read only memory card for the purpose of recording the ECG and audio data in memory. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have used the read only memory card in the modified Platt system in order to provide a mechanism enabling the collected data to be reviewed and analyzed at a future time (col. 11 @ 3-16).

As to wireless communication, Rockwell et al. teach wireless communication using infrared and radio frequency communication signals for the purpose of conveying information to remote locations. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have used infrared and radio frequency signals in the modified Platt system in order to enable sharing of information and report generation to optimize the patient's treatment (col. 5 @ 2-17).

As to an audio unit, Rockwell et al. teach event recording using an audio unit for the purpose of documenting events associated with patient interaction and care. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have used an audio unit in the modified Platt system in order to provide a more comprehensive understanding of the patient's condition and the treatment afforded the patient so the events are accurately reconstructed (col. 10 @ 1-9).

As to signal analysis, Rockwell et al. teach cardiac signal evaluation using signal analysis for the purpose of detecting the cardiac rhythm of the heart. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have used signal analysis in the modified Platt system in order to alert the user to cardiac condition, so conditions such as ventricular tachycardia requiring immediate medical attention can be identified and treated

Art Unit: 3766

(col. 10 @ 49-51).

11. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Platt (US 6730025) in view of Flach et al. (US 6773396) and Albrecht et al. (US 5891045) and further in view of Mogi (US 5873838). As discussed in paragraph 2 of this action, modified Platt discloses the claimed invention except for a baseline sway filter.

Mogi teaches electrocardiogram signal processing using a notch filter for the purpose of removing the sway / fluctuation produced by noise from the electrocardiogram signal. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have a notch filter for removing sway from the baseline electrocardiogram signal in the modified Platt system in order to provide a mechanism to produce an accurate and appropriate electrocardiogram waves for the processing unit so optimal diagnosis and treatment can be provided (abstract; col. 6 @ 34-44).

Other Prior Art Cited

12. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to the Applicant's disclosure. US 6654631 to Sahai teaches the use of a twelve lead EKG with a portable monitoring device (col. 1 @ 64).

Statutory Basis


13. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Fran Oropeza whose telephone number is (571) 272-4953. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert E. Pezzuto can be reached on (571) 272-6996. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300 for regular communication and for After Final communications.


MARK BOCKELMAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Frances P. Oropeza
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 3766


11-29-05